arXiv:0704.1178v1 [hep-ph] 10 Apr 2007

TU-788

Large Gauge Hierarchy in Gauge-Higgs Unification

Kazunori Takenaga$^{(a)}$ [1]

$^{(a)}$ *Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan*

Abstract

We study a five dimensional nonsupersymmetric $SU(3)$ gauge theory compactified on $M^4 \times S^1/Z_2$. The gauge hierarchy is discussed in the scenario of the gauge-Higgs unification. We present two models in which the large gauge hierarchy is realized, that is, the weak scale is naturally is obtained from an unique large scale such as a GUT and the Planck scale. We also study the Higgs mass in each model.

keywords: gauge symmetry breaking, extra dimensions, boundary conditions

---

[1] E-mail: takenaga@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp
Collaboration with M. Sakamoto (Kobe), dragon@kobe-u.ac.jp
Talk given at the SCGT06, International Workshop on "Origin of Mass and Strong Coupling Gauge Theories" 21-24 November 2006, Nagoya, Japan

1 Introduction

Higher dimensional gauge theory has been paid much attention as a new approach to overcome the hierarchy problem in the standard model without introducing supersymmetry. In particular, the gauge-Higgs unification is a very attractive idea [1, 2, 3]. The higher dimensional gauge symmetry plays a role to suppress the ultraviolet effect on the Higgs mass. The Higgs self interaction is understood as part of the original five dimensional gauge coupling, so that the mass and the interaction can be predicted in the gauge-Higgs unification. The gauge-Higgs unification has been studied extensively [4].

In the gauge-Higgs unification, the Higgs field corresponds to the Wilson line phase, which is nonlocal quantity. The Higgs potential is generated at the one-loop level after the compactification. Because of the nonlocality, the Higgs potential never suffers from the ultraviolet effect [5], which is the genuine local effect, and the Higgs mass calculated from the potential is finite as well. In other words, the Higgs potential and the mass are calculable in the gauge-Higgs unification. This is a remarkable feature rarely happens in the usual quantum field theory. It is understood that the feature entirely comes from shift symmetry manifest through the Wilson line phase, which is a remnant of the higher dimensional gauge symmetry appeared in four dimensions. The Higgs mass does not depend on the cutoff at all, so that two tremendously separated energy scales can be stable in the gauge-Higgs unification.

We study a five dimensional nonsupersymmetric $SU(3)$ gauge theory, where one of spatial coordinates compactified on an orbifold S^1/Z_2. We find two models (model I, II) which realize the large gauge hierarchy [6].

2 Gauge-Higgs unification

As the simplest example of the gauge-Higgs unification, we study a nonsupersymmetric $SU(3)$ gauge theory on $M^4 \times S^1/Z_2$, where M^4 is the four dimensional Minkowski spacetime and S^1/Z_2 is an orbifold which has two fixed points, $y = 0, \pi R$.

We impose the twisted boundary condition of the field for the S^1 direction and at the fixed points by using the gauge degrees of freedom,

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{\hat{\mu}}(x, y+2\pi R) &= U A_{\hat{\mu}}(x,y)\, U^\dagger, &(1)\\
\begin{pmatrix} A_\mu \\ A_y \end{pmatrix}(x, y_i - y) &= P_i \begin{pmatrix} A_\mu \\ -A_y \end{pmatrix}(x, y_i + y), P_i^\dagger, \quad (i=0,1) &(2)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $U^\dagger = U^{-1}, P_i^\dagger = P_i = P_i^{-1}$ and $y_0 = 0, y_1 = \pi R$ and $\hat{\mu}$ stands for $\hat{\mu} = (\mu, y)$. The minus sign for A_y is needed to preserve the invariance of the Lagrangian under these transformations. A transformation $\pi R + y \xrightarrow{P_1} \pi R - y$ must be the same as $\pi R + y \xrightarrow{P_0} -(\pi R + y) \xrightarrow{U} \pi R - y$, so that we obtain $U = P_1 P_0$. Here we choose $P_0 = P_1 = \text{diag.}(-1,-1,1)$.

The gauge symmetry at low energies consists of the zero modes for $A_\mu^{(0)a=1,2,3,8}$. We see that the orbifolding boundary condition P_i breaks the original gauge symmetry $SU(3)$ down to $SU(2)\times U(1)$ at the fixed points [7]. On the other hand, we observe that the zero mode for $A_y^{(0)}$ transforms as an $SU(2)$ doublet, so that we identify the Higgs field as

$$\Phi \equiv \sqrt{2\pi R}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\begin{array}{c} A_y^{(0)4} - iA_y^{(0)5} \\ A_y^{(0)6} - iA_y^{(0)7} \end{array}\right). \tag{3}$$

The VEV of the Higgs field is parametrized, by using the $SU(2)\times U(1)$ gauge degrees of freedom, as

$$\langle A_y^{(0)}\rangle \equiv \frac{a}{g_4 R}\frac{\lambda^6}{2} = A_y^{(0)6}\frac{\lambda^6}{2}, \tag{4}$$

where a is a dimensionless parameter. In order to determine a, one usually valuates the effective potential for a [2]. The gauge symmetry breaking depends on the values of a_0. It has been known that the matter content is crucial for the correct gauge symmetry breaking $SU(2)\times U(1)\to U(1)_{em}$.

3 Large gauge hierarchy in the gauge-Higgs unification

If the Higgs acquires the VEV, the W-boson becomes massive whose mass is given by $M_W = a_0/2R$. This relation defines an important ratio,

$$\frac{M_W}{M_c} = \pi a_0, \tag{5}$$

where $M_c \equiv (2\pi R)^{-1}$. Once the values of a_0 is determined as the minimum of the effective potential, the compactification scale M_c is fixed through Eq.(5). In the usual scenario of the gauge-Higgs unification, the VEV is of order of $O(10^{-2})$ for appropriate choice of the flavor set[8] and this yields $M_c \sim$ a few TeV. In order to realize the large gauge hierarchy such as $M_c \sim M_{GUT}, M_{Planck}$, one needs the very small values of a_0.

For the very small values of a, the effective potential can be expanded as

$$\bar{V}_{eff}(a) = -\frac{\zeta(3)}{2}C^{(2)}(\pi a)^2 + \frac{(\pi a)^4}{24}\left[C^{(3)}\left(-\ln(\pi a)+\frac{25}{12}\right)+C^{(4)}(\ln 2)\right]+\cdots, \tag{6}$$

where $V_{eff}(a)\equiv C\bar{V}_{eff}(a)$ with $C\equiv \Gamma(\frac{5}{2})/\pi^{\frac{5}{2}}(2\pi R)^5$, and the coefficient $C^{(i)} (i=2,3,4)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} C^{(2)} &\equiv 24N_{adj}^{(+)} + 4N_{fd}^{(+)} + \frac{9d}{2}N_{adj}^{(-)s} + \frac{3}{2}N_{fd}^{(-)s} \\ &\quad -\left(18 + 6dN_{adj}^{(+)s} + 2N_{fd}^{(+)s} + 18N_{adj}^{(-)} + 3N_{fd}^{(-)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$C^{(3)} \equiv 72N_{adj}^{(+)} + 4N_{fd}^{(+)} - \left(54 + 18dN_{adj}^{(+)s} + 2N_{fd}^{(+)s}\right), \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C^{(4)} &\equiv 48 + 16dN_{adj}^{(+)s} + 18dN_{adj}^{(-)s} + 2N_{fd}^{(-)s} \\ &\quad -\left(64N_{adj}^{(+)} + 4N_{fd}^{(-)} + 72N_{adj}^{(-)}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We emphasize that each coefficient in the effective potential is given by the discrete values, that is, the flavor number of the massless bulk matter. This is the very curious feature of the Higgs potential, which is hardly seen in the usual quantum field theory, and is a key point to discuss the large gauge hierarchy in the gauge-Higgs unification.

3.1 Model I

We impose a condition $C^{(2)} = 0$ in order to obtain the hierarchically small VEV. One should note that the condition is not the fine tuning of the parameter usually done in the quantum field theory. This condition is fulfilled by the choice of the flavor set. By minimizing the Higgs potential, we obtain that

$$M_W = M_c \exp\left(-\frac{C^{(4)}}{|C^{(3)}|}\ \ln 2 + \frac{11}{6}\right). \tag{10}$$

We see that the large gauge hierarchy $M_c \sim M_{GUT}, M_{Planck}$ is realized for the large ratio, $C^{(4)}/\left|C^{(3)}\right| \gg 1$. The magnitude of the ratio for the values of $p = 11, 19$, where p is defined by $M_c \equiv 10^p$ GeV, is $C^{(4)}/\left|C^{(3)}\right| \simeq 32.54$ $(p = 11), 59.12$ $(p = 19)$. The large gauge hierarchy is realized if we have $C^{(2)} = 0$ and the large ratio $C^{(4)}/\left|C^{(3)}\right|$ at the same time.

Let us present a few examples of the flavor set in the model I. We choose $(k, m) = (1, 0)$ as a demonstration. Then, we find that

$$(N_{adj}^{(+)}, dN_{adj}^{(+)s}) = (1,1), (2,5), \cdots,\ (N_{fd}^{(+)}, N_{fd}^{(+)s}) = (0,3), (1,5), \cdots.$$

For $(k, m, p) = (1, 0, 19)$,

$$(N_{adj}^{(-)}, dN_{adj}^{(-)s}) = (0,29), (1,33), \cdots,\ (N_{fd}^{(-)}, N_{fd}^{(-)s}) = (42,1), (43,3), \cdots.$$

For $(k, m, p) = (1, 0, 11)$,

$$(N_{adj}^{(-)}, dN_{adj}^{(-)s}) = (0,16), (1,20), \cdots,\ (N_{fd}^{(-)}, N_{fd}^{(-)s}) = (22,1), (23,3), \cdots.$$

We observe that the flavor numbers $dN_{adj}^{(-)s}, N_{fd}^{(-)}$ are of order $O(10)$. One has to take care about the reliability of perturbation theory for such the large number of flavor because an expansion parameter in the present case may be given by $(g_4^2/4\pi^2)N_{flavor}$, and it must be $(g_4^2/4\pi^2)N_{flavor} \ll 1$ for reliable perturbative expansion.

Now, let us study the Higgs mass in the model I. The Higgs mass squared is obtained by the second derivative of the effective potential evaluated at the minimum of the potential (6),

$$m_H^2 = \frac{3g_4^2}{16\pi^2}\ M_W^2\ \left(-\frac{C^{(3)}}{6}\right)\left(= \frac{3g_4^2}{16\pi^2}\ M_W^2\ k < M_W^2\right). \tag{11}$$

The choice $k = 1$ is the most desirable one for the large gauge hierarchy, so that the Higgs mass is lighter than M_W, which is the same result in the original Coleman-Weinberg's paper [9]. Therefore, one concludes that the large gauge hierarchy and the sufficiently heavy Higgs mass are not compatible in the model I.

3.2 Model II

We study another model called Model II in this subsection. We introduce massive bulk fermions [10, 11, 12] in addition to the massless bulk matter in the model I. We introduce a pair of the fields, ψ_+ and ψ_- whose parity is different to each other, $\psi_\pm(-y) = \pm\psi_\pm(y)$. Then, a parity even mass term is constructed like $M\bar{\psi}_+\psi_-$.

The contribution to the mass term from the massive fermions is given by

$$\frac{1}{2}\zeta(3)C^{(2)}(\pi a)^2 \to -\frac{1}{2}\left[\zeta(3)C^{(2)} + 8N_{pair}B^{(2)}\right](\pi a)^2 \quad \text{with}$$

$$B^{(2)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^3}\left(1 + nz + \frac{n^2z^2}{3}\right)\mathrm{e}^{-nz},$$

where N_{pair} stands for the number of the pair $(\psi^{(+)}, \psi^{(-)})$ and we have defined a dimensionless parameter $z \equiv 2\pi RM = M/M_c$. We observe that the potential is suppressed by the Boltzmann-like factor e^{-nz}, reflecting the fact that the effective potential shares similarity with that in finite temperature field theory [13].

The essential behavior of the VEV is governed by the factor $B^{(2)}$, *i.e.* $\pi a_0 \simeq \gamma B^{(2)}$ with some numerical constant γ of order 1. If we write $\pi a_0 = \mathrm{e}^{-Y}$, then, one finds, remembering Eq.(5), that

$$-Y = \ln(\pi a_0)\left(= \ln\left(\frac{M_W}{M_c}\right)\right) = (2-p)\ln 10 \simeq \begin{cases} -34.539 & \text{for} \quad p = 17, \\ -20.723 & \text{for} \quad p = 11. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

The gauge hierarchy is controlled by the magnitude of Y, in other words, the bulk mass parameter z, and the large gauge hierarchy is achieved by $|z| \simeq 30 \sim 40$. The large gauge hierarchy is realized by the presence of the massive bulk fermion. We notice that the flavor number of the massless bulk matter is not essential for the large gauge hierarchy in the model II.

Now, let us next discuss the Higgs mass in the model II. The Higgs mass is given by

$$m_H^2 = \frac{g_4^2}{16\pi^2}M_W^2\left[-C^{(3)}\ln(\pi a_0) + \frac{4}{3}C^{(3)} + C^{(4)}\ln 2\right] = \frac{g_4^2}{16\pi^2}M_W^2\ F, \tag{13}$$

where we have defined

$$F \equiv -C^{(3)}\ln(\pi a_0) + \frac{4}{3}C^{(3)} + C^{(4)}\ln 2. \tag{14}$$

The Higgs mass depends on the logarithmic factor. We observe that the larger the gauge hierarchy is, the heavier the Higgs mass is. An important point is that the coefficient $C^{(3)}$ is not related with the realization of the large gauge hierarchy, so that it is not constrained by the requirement of the large gauge hierarchy at all.

In order to demonstrate the size of the Higgs mass in the model II, let us choose $(k, l, m) = (-4, -1, -1)$. Then, the flavor set is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (N_{adj}^{(-)}, dN_{adj}^{(-)s}) &= (1,3),\ (2,7), \cdots,\ (N_{fd}^{(-)}, N_{fd}^{(-)s}) = (3,1),\ (4,3), \cdots, \\ (N_{fd}^{(+)}, N_{fd}^{(+)s}) &= (2,1),\ (3,3), \cdots,\ (N_{adj}^{(+)}, dN_{adj}^{(+)s}) = (1,0),\ (2,4), \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

And the Higgs mass in GeV unit is calculated as

$$m_H \simeq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 119.5 & \text{for} \quad p = 17, \\ 92.6 & \text{for} \quad p = 11, \end{array} \right.$$

where we have used $g_4^2 \simeq 0.42$. Here, we note that in the usual scenario of the gauge-Higgs unification, one requires $g_4 \sim O(1)$ in order to have the heavy enough Higgs mass [14, 8]. The large gauge hierarchy enhances the Higgs mass sizably even for the weak coupling. We observe that for the fixed integers (k, l), the large gauge hierarchy, that is, large $\ln(\pi a_0) = -Y$ enhances the size of the Higgs mass. The larger the gauge hierarchy is, the heavier the Higgs mass tends to be.

4 Conclusions and discussions

We have studied the five dimensional nonsupersymmetric $SU(3)$ model compactified on $M^4 \times S^1/Z_2$, which is the simplest model to realize the scenario of the gauge-Higgs unification. We have discussed whether the large gauge hierarchy is realized in the scenario or not. The Higgs potential is generated at the one-loop level and is obtained in a finite form, reflecting the nonlocal nature that the Higgs field is the Wilson line phase in the gauge-Higgs unification. The Higgs potential is calculable and accordingly, the Higgs mass, too. We have found two models (model I, II), in which the large gauge hierarchy is realized. The condition $C^{(2)} = 0$ is crucial for our discussions.

In connection with the condition, it may be worth mentioning that there are examples, in which the loop correction is exhausted at the one-loop level (without supersymmetry). They are the coefficient of the axial anomaly[15] and the Chern-Simons coupling [16]. As for the latter case, a simple reason for the two (higher) loop correction not to be generated comes from the invariance of the action under the large gauge transformation. Since the shift symmetry of the Higgs potential can be regarded as the invariance under the large gauge transformation, one may be able to prove that there is no two (higher)-loop correction to the mass term of the Higgs potential. In order to confirm it, one needs more studies of the higher loop corrections to the Higgs potential (mass) in the gauge-Higgs unification [17].

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor K. Yamawaki and other members of the organizing committee for their hospitality and for inviting me to participate in SCGT 2006. This work was supported by the 21st Century COE Program at Tohoku University.

References

[1] N. S. Manton, *Nucl. Phys.* **B158** 141 (1979), D. B. Fairlie, *Phys. Lett.* **82B** (1979) 97, N. V. Krasnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **273B** (1991) 246,

[2] Y. Hosotani, *Phys. Lett.* **126B** (1983) 309, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **190**, 233 (1989).

[3] H. Hatanaka, T. Inami and C.S. Lim, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A13** (1998) 2601, G. R. Dvali, S. Randjbar-Daemi and R. Tabbash, *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 064021, N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen and H. Georgi, *Phys. Lett.* **B513** (2001) 232, I. Antiniadis, K. Benakli and M. Quiros, New J. Phys. **3**, (2001),20.

[4] K. Takenaga, *Phys. Rev.* **D64** (2001) 066001, *Phys. Rev.* **D66** (2002) 085009, Y. Hosotani, S. Noda and K. Takenaga, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 125014, *Phys. Lett.* **B607** (2005) 276, N. Haba, K. Takenaga and T. Yamashita, *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 025006, N. Maru and K. Takenaga, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** (2005) 046003, *Phys. Rev.* **D74** (2006) 015017, K. Takenaga, *Phys. Lett.* **425B** (1998) 114, *Phys. Rev.* **D58** (1998) 026004.

[5] A. Masiero, C. A. Scrucca, M. Serone and L. Silvestrini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** 251601 (2001).

[6] M. Sakamoto and K. Takenaga, *Phys. Rev.* **D75** (2007) 045015.

[7] M. Kubo, C. S. Lim and H. Yamashita, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A17** (2002) 2249, L. J. Hall, Y. Nomura and D. R. Smith, *Nucl. Phys.* **B639** (2002) 307, G. Burdman and Y. Nomura, *Nucl. Phys.* **B656** (2002) 3.

[8] N. Haba, K. Takenaga and T. Yamashita, *Phys. Lett.* **B615** (2005) 247.

[9] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D7** (1973) 1888.

[10] K. Takenaga, *Phys. Lett.* **B570** (2003) 244.

[11] N. Haba, K. Takenaga and T. Yamashita, *Phys. Lett.* **B605** (2005) 355.

[12] N. Maru and K. Takenaga, *Phys. Lett.* **B637** (2006) 287.

[13] L. Dolan and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev.* **D9** (1974) 3320.

[14] N. Haba, Y. Hosotani, Y. Kawamura and T. Yamashita, *Phys. Rev.* **D70** (2004) 01510.

[15] S. L. Adler and W. A. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev.* **182** (1969) 1517.

[16] H. So, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **73** (1985) 528, S. Coleman and B. Hill, *Phys. Lett.* **159B** (1985) 184. M. Sakamoto and H. Yamashita, *Phys. Lett.* **B476** (2000) 427.

[17] Y. Hosotani, in the Proceedings of "Dynamical Symmetry Breaking", ed. M. Harada and K. Yamawaki (Nagoya University, 2004), P17. (hep-ph/0504272), hep-ph/0607064, Y. Hosotani, N. Maru, K. Takenaga and T. Yamashita, work in progress.